

HST 203: History of the United States Sp17 (Escobar Meta 41054 41053)

Home ► My courses ► HST 203 Sp17 (Escobar Meta 41054 41053) ► Week 4 ► Forum 2 ►
The Role of the U.S. in the World

 Search forums

Forum 2

The Role of the U.S. in the World

[• Subscribe](#)[◀ The Role of the U.S. in the World](#)[Taxation ▶](#)

The Role of the U.S. in the World

by Joe Escobar - Friday, April 21, 2017, 11:29 PM

This thread is for discussions on the The Role of the U.S. in the World topic.

To make your POSTS, click the reply link in this, MY post. To reply to another student's post, be sure to click the reply link within in THEIR post.

IMPORTANT - SUBJECT LINES

BE SURE to use an informative subject line for your post, something that describes which question(s) you are addressing . Do NOT simply leave it RE: The Role of the U.S. in the World

Sum of ratings: -

[Permalink](#) | [Edit](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



My place on the spectrum

by Jeff Johnson - Monday, April 24, 2017, 12:37 AM

In the video with Paul and McCain when Ron Paul tells McCain that he doesn't know the difference between non-interventionism and isolationism is about exactly where I stand on this issue. I would have to say I'm a non-interventionist and agree with Paul it doesn't mean that I think America should isolate itself from the rest of the world. I think McCain shows how ridiculous he is when he brings up Hitler in any comparison trying to justify America's modern empire. I am one who believes that America should not have a military spread across the globe and the calls for the use of force is rarely worth the inevitable

outcome. The world is not black and white and a few things like genocide are worth the discussion but as pointed out by G. John Ikenberry and Anne-Marie Slaughter In the video "The Crisis in American Foreign Policy" the excuse for the use of military force is a slippery slope with small actions almost always leading to larger. I do believe the US should be involved in the global discussion but have a hard time with things like the UN where a few countries dominate the discussion. I tend to agree with Lodge "After the war, Wilson's concept of a League of Nations that would obligate the United States to fight future wars without the consent of Congress violated Lodge's belief that the use of force should spring from the united will of the American people"(HNN, So Henry Cabot Lodge Was One of History's Villains?).

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



A Mild Reservationist's View

by Bailey Davis - Monday, April 24, 2017, 4:40 PM

After reviewing the given text and videos, I find myself in the position of mild reservationist on the internationalist to isolationist spectrum. I see Woodrow Wilson's proposed Treaty of Versailles and League of Nations as a generally good idea. However, I don't agree that by joining the League of Nations, the United States could be obligated to fight in wars without the vote of congress. I agree with Henry Lodge's view that "the use of force should spring from the united will of the American people" (History News Network article), and that a congressional vote is a tool for showing the will of the people. I believe a large number of Americans living in the WWI postwar society would agree with me; such as the veterans who had been displaced from their civilian jobs back home after fighting in Europe, or the workers struggling against the inflation that the war had caused (textbook, pg. 769). The textbook even states that, "More and more Americans - perhaps even a majority - were coming to believe that U.S. intervention [in the war] had been a mistake" (pg. 774).

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: A Mild Reservationist's View

by Hope Walston - Saturday, April 29, 2017, 12:49 AM

I don't quite understand when you say you don't agree that the U.S. would be obligated to join the fight if we were a part of the League on Nations. Henry Lodge said "After the war, Wilson's concept of a League of Nations that would obligate the United States to fight future wars without the consent of Congress violated Lodge's belief that the use of force should spring from the united will of the American people" (The Henry Lodge, Villain article). I'd say this implies that we would be obligated to fight in a war without congress consent. It

would probably happen in The League of Nations is that a member country would be attacked by another country and the countries allied with the one attacked would have already agreed to back them if they were attacked. Not only obligated but expected to because they already agreed too.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) 1

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Reservationists

by Hope Walston - Monday, April 24, 2017, 6:28 PM

I think I would say that I lean more towards reservationists than anything else. I like that Henry Lodge had revisions for the League of Nations, or he would not agree to it. As it stood the League of nations could force the U.S. into war without congressional approval. I believe that the revisions Lodge made were for the better.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) 1

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: The argument against foreign intervention

by Abigail Gierut - Monday, April 24, 2017, 10:50 PM

There are strong arguments for both foreign policies, but the argument that makes the most sense to me is non-intervention. Non-intervention is the policy to not get involved in other nations affairs unless it directly affects the United States. Ron Paul argues against intervention by giving three main reasons: "It doesn't work, there are too many unintended consequences, and to spread our goodness overseas usually requires force" (Ron Paul ABC interview 5:06). He also talks about how we shouldn't keep troops in foreign countries and that we have no constitutional authority to do so when we are not at war. He goes even further to prove his point on foreign affairs and simply states that "we can't afford it anymore"(Ron Paul ABC interview 10:00). One of the only opinions of Ron Paul on foreign policy that I particularly disagree with is that "There's never a moral justification to start a war" (Ron Paul ABC interview 5:40). I believe that there are very specific circumstances in which it is perfectly reasonable to start a war and it would be morally wrong to not get involved. In the video "The Crisis in American Foreign Policy", Anne-Marie Slaughter addresses these circumstances in which we have an international responsibility to intervene: "If at some point a nation's failure to provide for their people becomes so great, as to amount as an attack on the people, the gross failure to protect, then it is an international responsibility to act" (6:09).

Sum of ratings:3 (1) 3

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: The Role of the U.S. in the World, Keyes and Lodge

by Kejana Potts - Monday, April 24, 2017, 11:53 PM

"We are a nation of nations. A people of many peoples." (Alan Keyes) We could argue that more power brings more responsibility, but I believe Keyes' ideas are a stronger argument for involvement in international affairs. We are a nation of diverse backgrounds. Individual Americans are connected to other people in all four corners of the world. Even if you and I don't know someone directly in another country, we are still able to sympathise with those

who are suffering elsewhere. When a tsunami struck Japan in 2008 I was glued to the T.V. I mourned for people I had never known and had a deep compassion for their suffering, because they're humans too. It is this connection that draws us into the affairs of other countries.

Though it's important to interact with the rest of the world, we must be mindful of our actions and the groups we join. When it comes to the League of Nations, I agree with Henry C. Lodge belief "that the use of force should spring from the united will of the American people." (historynewsnetwork.org 8th paragraph) How can we call ourselves a free country when we surrender our National Sovereignty. Surrendering to the pressures and ideals of other powers would inevitably threaten our own. The league of Nations may have claimed peace to be their goal, each country has their unspoken motives, and we should not give up our freedom for the unlikely chance of world peace.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: The Role of the U.S. in the World, Keye and Lodge

by Abigail Gierut - Saturday, April 29, 2017, 8:57 PM

I agree with your position on joining the league of nations,Kejana Potts. You said that "the league of nations may have claimed peace to be their goal, but each country has their unspoken motives and we should not give up our freedom for unlikely chance of work peace." This reminded me of what the textbook says on page 765, referring to "the Allies' single-minded pursuit of self-interest". When negotiating the Treaty of Versailles and Wilson's proposal of the 14 points, the Allies only agreed to the points that would further their self interests.I believe a large factor contributing to the Allies agreeing to joining the League of Nations was based off of selfish desires to want to have these strong nations to back them up if there were to be another world war. These selfish ideals could be very dangerous considering that the League of Nations would have power to chose if the U.S. should be involved in international conflict and even decide when or when not we can go to war despite the cost it would take on the United States interests. "Did Americans want to authorize an international organization to decide when the United States would go to war? Was this not a violation of the Constitution, which vested war-making power solely in Congress? Even if the constitutional problem could be solved, how could the United States ensure that it would not be forced into a military action that might damage its national interest?" (Textbook pg. 766).

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Intervention vs non-intervention in recent events

by Abigail Gierut - Thursday, April 27, 2017, 2:19 PM

A great example for the argument of intervention versus non-intervention is the United States recent involvement in an attack against Syria in response to a gas attack against their own civilians. For those of you who might be unaware of this incident, I found a NY Times article that explains what took place. "On April 4th, there was chemical attack in northwestern Syria that killed dozens of civilians, women and children included. Western leaders including President Trump blamed the Syrian government for this horrific act. The government of Syrian President Bashar al-Assad, who renounced chemical weapons nearly four years ago after a large chemical attack that American intelligence agencies concluded was carried out by his

forces, denied that his military had been responsible, as he has done every time chemical munitions have been used in Syria”(NYTimes article). Now here comes the argument of whether or not to intervene. Some, like Ron Paul would have been completely against getting involved stating that “The United States should not be the world’s police man”(Ron Paul ABC interview 4:40), and that we should stay out of the rest of the world’s affairs unless it directly affects America and its citizens. As I talked about in an earlier forum post, Ron paul strongly believed that “there’s never a moral justification to start a war”(Ron Paul ABC interview 5:40), as retaliation very well could lead to a war. As many of you may know, President Donald Trump didn’t share Ron Paul’s non-interventionist and semi-isolationist views and retaliated by launching a targeted military strike on the air base in Syria, in which he claimed was where the chemical attack was launched from. According to the same NY Times article they say that “the White House called the attack (the chemical attack) a “reprehensible” act against innocent people “that cannot be ignored by the civilized world.” This sounded very familiar and reminded me of what Anne-Marie Slaughter said about certain circumstances in which it is our responsibility to intervene. Mary Slaughter said “If at some point, their failure to provide for their people becomes so great--as great as to amount as an attack on those people-- the gross failure to protect, then it is an international responsibility to act”(The Crisis in American Foreign Policy video 6:08). Some might say that this recent Syrian incident would be a perfect example for her reasoning for when to retaliate.

NY Times article source <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/04/04/world/middleeast/syria-gas-attack.html>

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Paul, Keyes, and McCain

by Hope Walston - Saturday, April 29, 2017, 4:15 PM

Well I have to say I don’t really agree with any of the three, Paul, Keyes, or McCain. I do however like bits and pieces from each. From Paul, in his response to McCain, says “...nonintervention and isolationism, I’m not an isolationist, I want to trade with people, talk with people travel but I don’t want to send our troops overseas using force to tell them how to live...” (John McCain on isolationism video, forum info). I agree that we shouldn’t send troops and force others to be a country like us. They have their own way of living, own traditions, and it’s not our job to ruin that. From Keyes I agree when he says “...we are a nation of nations, a people of many people, we are in touch with every people on the face of the Earth, if somebody’s being hurt somewhere in the world, somebody in America grieves for them...” (Alan Keyes on Darfur video, forum info). I agree with this because I am constantly hearing stories of Americans being emotionally moved by happenings in other countries and they end up going to a foreign country to see what they can do to help. There are Americans all over the world trying to help others. I’m on the line about agreeing with McCain on how U.S. isolationism caused WWII. I can see where he is coming from but at the same time it is a big statement to make.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Ron Paul, Pulling troops out

by Hope Walston - Saturday, April 29, 2017, 6:44 PM

When Ron Paul, in the ABC interview, says, regarding pulling troops out of every country, "...we can't afford it anymore, we're going broke we are on the verge of doing what all great empires have done in the past, spread themselves far too wide around the world and then they have to come home because the currency is finally devalued and depreciated to the point where you can't afford it anymore and that's what the markets are telling us right now." I half way agree with him on this. I think maybe pulling out of a couple countries and bringing troops home could be beneficial to the economy. But on the other hand I think we should stay put in other countries. A lot of the forum topics that are put up are hard to decide a side on. There are a lot of topics that just aren't so easily black and white and I believe this is one of them.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Similar but not by much

by Hope Walston - Saturday, April 29, 2017, 8:27 PM

I think Ron Paul and Henry Lodge are similar in a way. Paul wants to pull American troops out of all countries and thinks that the U.S. should not go/join a war without a just cause. I feel that if Paul was presented with the League of Nations, he would have changed the same thing Henry Lodge did. I don't think Paul would want the U.S. to be pulled into war without congress consent. I don't know if these two men would agree on much but I believe they would agree on that.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Isolationist vs. Internationalist

by Amelia Salzman - Saturday, April 29, 2017, 9:19 PM

I have never really thought about whether I was an internationalist or an isolationist. When I first started watching the Ron Paul Video I thought he had some interesting points. Like most people I don't like war and I would like to see the national debt go down. When he brought up these two points I was curious. But as the video continued I was troubled by Paul's stance against intervention in cases of genocide and human rights violations. When I continued on the video focusing on Darfur I saw even more of the flaws in Ron Paul's view. Although I believe John McCain oversimplified the cause of WW2 I do think he has a valid point in favor of staying involved throughout the world. It felt like the more Ron Paul explained his point of view the less I agreed with it. I guess I would have to say after these videos, I lean toward internationalist views. Although I do see the points being made by isolationist.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Wilson vs. G.W. Bush

by Amelia Salzman - Saturday, April 29, 2017, 9:20 PM

I think the comparison between Wilson and G.W. Bush is fascinating but not accurate. When I first saw the title of the video it seemed like an interesting point but once I watch the video and the things pointed out made it clear that these two presidents are very different. I thought the point about Wilson's views in self-determination defiantly differs from Bush. The biggest problem for me with this comparison came for me when it was pointed out Bush had a very

“cavalier” treatment of international institution. (3:12) as we talked about in class the League of Nations was so important to Wilson and his presidency that it shows a major difference in these two.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

◀ [The Role of the U.S. in the World](#)

[Taxation](#) ▶

 [Moodle Docs for this page](#)

[Accessibility at Lane](#)

You are logged in as Joe Escobar ([Log out](#))

HST 203 Sp17 (Escobar Meta 41054 41053)